

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/046,734	01/17/2002	Richa	Richard E. Lyon		2574	
75	90 05/17/2004			EXAM	INER	
James R. Dann DOT, C-10		***			NOLAND, THOMAS	
400 7th Street, S				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Washington, Do	C 20590	•		2856		
				DATE MAILED: 05/17/2004	, 	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summan	10/046,734	LYON ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit
	Thomas P. Noland	2856
Th MAILING DATE of this communication apperent of the Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period with Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication.
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 De	ecember 2003.	•
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)□ This	action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	ce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the ments is
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex	x <i>parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) <u>11-17</u> is/are pending in the application	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	in from consideration.	
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>11-17</u> is/are rejected. 7)□ Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	oloction requirement	
o/ Orallin(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce		xaminer
Applicant may not request that any objection to the d		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction	•	
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	*	
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign p a) All b) Some * c) None of:	onority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori	* *	
application from the International Bureau		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	f the certified copies not received	d.
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (	
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)</li> </ul>	Paper No(s)/Mail Date  5) Notice of Informal Pa	te atent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	i :
0.00		

Application/Control Number: 10/046,734

Art Unit: 2856

- 1. The amendment filed Dec. 31, 2003 has been entered.
- 2. Claims 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear what is meant by "a mixture of the types of plastic normally found in the cargo compartment of an airplane". Applicant's argument that this is clear because the specification refers to types of plastic typically found in luggage is noted but such is not believed to remove the unclarity since the term is clearly not specific and plastic other than that in the luggage might typically be found in the cargo compartment, for example making up part of the structure therein. It is suggested that lines 2-3 of claim 12 be replaced with - - - mixture of types of plastic. - - -

3. Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bute US 4,271,643 in view of Spector et al US 5,610,359.

Bute in Fig. 1 and the abstract discloses a smoldering fire detector substantially as claimed but does not generate the smoke with a porous sample having an internal heating element. But such is a known configuration for a smoke generator as evident from Fig. 1 and col. 11, lines 57- col. 12, line 4 of Spector et al which shows an igniter element 14 embedded in the sample and would thus have been obvious to have incorporated into a testing system similar to that of Bute for greater control of the simulation. Spector et al also indicates that such systems are useful in the storage

Application/Control Number: 10/046,734

Art Unit: 2856

compartments of aircraft in col. 13, lines 47-52 and thus at least provides some suggestion of the desirability of the use of such systems in aircraft. This in combination with the general expedient of making the material of the substance being simulated would have made it an obvious expedient when simulating a test involving a fire in an airplane of such material to have used such material. Likewise adding a flammable liquid to simulate an actual file in addition to smoldering or to make the smoldering rate change would have been an obvious expedient to increase the accuracy of the simulation.

- 4. Claims 14-17 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 5. Applicant's arguments filed Dec. 31, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. While agreed that neither reference shows all of the features claimed it is believed the teachings of the references in combination for the reasons set forth in the prior art rejection render the invention of claims 11-13 obvious.
- 6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Application/Control Number: 10/046,734

Art Unit: 2856

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tom Noland whose telephone number is (571) 272-2202. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 9:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Hezron E. Williams, can be reached on (571) 272-2208.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Thomas P. Noland Primary Examiner Art Unit 2856

one Neld

Page 4

tpn May 11, 2004